REMARKS

I.   Overview

These remarks are set forth in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed May 6, 2007. As this amendment has been timely filed within the three-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 16 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent in nature. In the Non-Final Office Action, claim 16 has been objected for a typographical error which has been corrected herein. Further claims 7 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Finally, claims 1-16 have been rejected on cited art. Specifically, claims 1 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,117,153 to Mahajan et al. (Mahajan). Additionally, claims 2 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Mahajan in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0173995 by Reich. Yet further, claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,706 to Yuschik. Finally, claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahajan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,797 to Randic.

II.   The Applicant's Invention

The Applicant has invented a system, method and apparatus for evaluating the quality of voice input recognition by a voice portal. The invention works by collecting a set of grammars for one or more voice applications disposed in a voice portal and testing the ability of the voice portal to recognize a particular grammar from among the set of other grammars that may be active with the particular grammar being tested. As such, a measure of quality of recognition can

be derived for each grammar, thereby enabling the voice portal to be reconfigured to allow for better voice input recognition.

III.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants have amended the preamble of claim 7 consistent with paragraphs [0035] and [0036] of the Applicant's specification, thereby obviating the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

IV.   Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

A.   Characterization of the Cited Art

1.   Mahajan

Mahajan teaches a method of modeling a speech recognition system. The method of Mahajan includes decoding a speech signal produced from a training text to produce a sequence of predicted speech units. The training text includes a sequence of actual speech units that is used with the sequence of predicted speech units to form a confusion model. The confusion model in turn can be used to decode a text to identify an error rate that would be expected if the speech recognition system decoded speech based on the text.

2.   Yuschik

Reich, by comparison, teaches a system for designing a voice activated user interface having a semantic and syntactic structure adapted to the culture and conventions of spoken

language for the intended users. The system of Reich poses to at least one respondent a hypothetical task to be performed. The system then asks each respondent for a word that the respondent would use to command the hypothetical task to be performed. Thereafter, the system receives from each respondent a command word. As a result, the system develops a list of command words from the received command word and rejects the received command word, if the received command word is acoustically similar to another word in the list of command words.

3. Reich

Reich relates to a method for performing speech recognition. The method can include receiving user speech and determining a plurality of potential candidates. Each of the candidates can provide a textual interpretation of the speech. Confidence scores can be calculated for the candidates. The confidence scores can be compared to a predetermined threshold. Also, selected ones of the plurality of candidates can be presented to the user as alternative interpretations of the speech when none of the confidence scores is greater than the predetermined threshold. Finally, the selected ones of the plurality of candidates can have confidence scores above a predetermined minimum threshold, and thus can have confidence scores within a predetermined range.

B. Traversal of the Rejections on the Art

Applicant's originally filed independent claims require the extraction of a current grammar from a **voice portal**. As is well-known in the art and demonstrated by a simple Internet search, the term voice portal generally refers to "a Web site or other service that a user can reach by telephone for information such as weather, sport scores, or stock quotes" (from WhatIs.com), or "the voice equivalent of Web Portals, giving access to information through spoken commands

and voice responses. Ideally a voice portal could be an access point for any type of information,

services, or transactions found on the Internet" (from Wikipedia), or "the interface between a

caller and an information source - it's the point of entry for a person using an IVR or speech

recognition system. When augmented with VoiceXML, the voice portal can host a much wider

variety of information, literally funneling any web-based data from your servers out to callers."

(from Call Center Magazine, January 29, 2001).

Exemplary claim 1 recites as follows:

1.   A method of evaluating the quality of voice input recognition by a voice portal, said
method comprising the steps of:

extracting a current grammar from the **voice portal**;

generating a test input for the current grammar, the test input including a test pattern and
a set of active grammars for the current grammar;

providing the test input to the **voice portal**;

analyzing the test pattern with respect to the set of active grammars with a speech
recognition engine in the **voice portal**; and

deriving a measure of quality of recognition for the current grammar.

Thus, as originally filed, claim 1 (and through similar language, claims 7 and 13) require the

presence of an interaction with a voice portal. Yet, the notion of a voice portal is wholly absent

within all cited references---especially Mahajan.

The Examiner in the Non-Final Office Action, relies exclusively upon Figure 3 of

Mahajan as the source of the equivalent "voice portal". Now that the Examiner understands what

the technical community of ordinary skilled artisans consider to be a "voice portal", however, the

Examiner will agree that neither Figure 3 nor any other portion of Mahajan contemplate a voice

portal as required by the express claim language of all of the claims 1-16. Consequently, the

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of all rejections based upon the Mahajan

reference because Mahajan fails to teach or suggest a voice portal as is well understood by the skilled artisan.

V.   Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102(e) and 103(a) owing to the clearly distinctive nature of a "voice portal" as recited in the claims and the content of the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 6, 2007

/Steven M. Greenberg/
Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP
950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3020
Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Customer No. 46322
Tel: (561) 922-3845
Fax: (561) 244-1062